6/26/72, 11:30 a.m.

Porr Howard!

I didn't dream, despite the opinion I had expressed to you, that you woule be subjected to the kind of onslaught you faced after calling me Thursday night. I have skimmed your memo written after Sylvia belabored you and me, Lil is reading it, and for your information and as a matter of record, I regret the need for a detailed record on some parts.

Garrison: It is true that I was originally impressed by him, personally, and I suppose by Mark's representation of his "case". BUT, the very first thing I did was to get him to agree to have Sylvia be his devil's advocate, she agreed too, and then she refused, almost immediately. It is also true as you say that I never did any Shaw work. It is not correctly pu, as I recall your memo, in saying that all I did was help him with Dealey Plaza stuff for the trial. I did. I gave him what is quite opposite Sylvia's deliberate lie about me and my attitude and purposes, all the medical stuff he used. I did other work, in no case connected with Shaw, in preparation, and when I learned of the "case", as you know, quit him cold. You do not represent my New Orleans work, however, which was on Oswald and the government, not with but independent of Garrison.

The meeting to which Sylvia refers in the UN cafeteria was before her book was out of page proof. I recall quite clearly her refusal to correct her error in the dating of the various works that, in the light of your reflection of her diatribe, now seems even more significant. At that time I had been to New Orleans but once and had not even discussed any aspect of his case with him. I never went through his files, a fact I now regret, hadn't dreamed of it then. I had three meetings with him on that first trip:The first night, at dinner with Mark, and I said practically nothing and there was no talk about Shaw or the case; the second two at his home the two nights before I left. There we discussed only what he now has distorted in the first part of his Heritage of Stone. So, at the time I saw Sylvia, just a short while after this first trip, I did not have the misgivings I soon enough developed (as I recall my first doubts were in November). What she attributes to this meeting came later, when I wanted to tell her things in confidence that she would not listen to. Ever. Her account of her reasons for refusing to visit are deliberate lies. I began giving her invitations in the winter of 1964-5, when I first met her, regularly thereafter, qnd she is referring to what came much later, cited above. The first kind of any disagreement between usx was over Epstein, as a matter of fact. And she took what The Sacvengers said at face value when the most casyal reading shows I could not have said what they quoted me as saying. It was totally impossible because it was a year before her book came out. So as early as then she was lookiig fkr something, if not earlier. You can see this in the files for at one point she wrote me about it. You can also see that as soon as I saw what Shhiller was up to I immediately wrote everyone, beginning with Capitol Records. One of the things I wanted to tell her in confidence had nothing to do with Thornley, as this comes back, but was, obviously, something I could not permit her using, about Garrison personally. Others were about my work, where the same is and still has to be true. So she is totally false in this aspect, beginning with timing and in all details. From the first public criticism my position was always the same: let him fall on his face in court. I don't think I ever deviated in public and Hoch and my correspondence with him will show the point at which I was clear in private. Sylvia has, at the best, replaced her desires for the facts. As you know, for years Garrisen and I have barely talked to each other.

Lil has returned you memo with a "poor Howard!", to which she added what is quite true, "You know I never trusted Sylvia." And she recommends you check the usage of "mollify" at the end. So, I'll skim from the beginning now. If I do not intend to argue, there are some things I must addres that can have this effect. And a half-hour has passed and I have had no call from Gary, Jerry, Cyril or Sylvia, and I sent what I did to all but Wecht in time for it to have reached them. Sylvia, of course, can have gotten it only if she didn't go to work until late or her mail came early. Friday she told you she would have Wecht call me. They none of them will unless they feel they must to protect themselves. Your second graph asks about Wecht wanting to know. He has not responded to letters, did not call at any time before this, and earlier failed to return to so many calls he had asked me to make that I don't expect him to. Aside: she says Wecht could not give me credit for doing his work for him. This is false, even at the trial, when he could have asked the court to

call me as an expert in a different sense, and he, personally, knew what files I had with me, having seen them as I prepared him in the very last minute for the more intricate aspects of his testimony. His indeed! It is false as it relates to all his subsequent uses of it, all pretended to be his own work, such as on Long John before Lattimer if not during it (I don't have the tape of the second appearance). Do I have to tell you that Sylvia pretended some of this was her personal work in a letter to the Times? It is not I who raised the question of "credit", which is in any event hardly the word. But in these far from complete respects I am addressing their motive. No plural, no accident. By the way, I am making extra copies of this, but I will not send one to any critic without your request. I will deposit one outside my possession, not with a critic.

Your third graph illustrates what I have been trying to tell you about these unscrupulous bastards. Sylvia and Wecht have both read my panel part. Why, if they are at all competennt for this or anything else, do they now require help from you-and with my work, whether or not you later discovered some of it on your own. Or is it now indecent to say my copy-righted work? So, Wecht has been repeatedly, your words, "alerted to the neck fragments, the head wound, etc." In writing and in several conversations and in more detail than you would now do, because it also includes part of III. Have you a diaper so big, Howard, for him, Sylvia, whomever?

If Wecht needs some background, again your worlds, what the fuck has the bastard been doing all these years of elf-advertising, what is he doing even asking to see the stuff? And if it seems, superfivially, a good idea to "at least steer him away from far-out, irrespondible things", can't you realize what you are into, how impossible a task you have undertaken?

Someplace you say Wecht has at this late date to be told about the absence of X-Rays of the extremities. May I remind you that a) this also is my copyrighted work and b) he read it and we discussed it? Can you overcome all this with a briefing? If he has to be reminded of that, what does he know and at this point I think it not unfair to ask really care? I don't believe I told youto "do whatever I could in the hopes of lessing the damages Wecht could do." I don't think it possible, and it is not in accord with my overall view. Your feeling sensing is correct as as I think on rereading you will see is inconsistent with thi preceeding sentence. If you took it this way, you misinterpreted or I put it poorly. From my point of view the more accurate he is the greater the chance of hurt. I'd rather have him make a mess of it for selfish reasons, too.

Where you do not desdribe them, I presume Sylvia's "oratories" were about me rather than your concern for your own integrity in this matter. And if she feels my fears are "utterly unfounded and unrealistic", may I remind you that she, Wecht, almost 100%, declined to engage in any kind of discourse on them, any kind of analysis. I suggest this is ample response to the genuineness of her representation.

Of course I desire to "protect" my work, just as she and Cyril desire to steal it. The difference is that I am entitled to mine and they are not. And so far as breaking the vase, a quote, you have seen my letters of long ago to Cyril telling him I had come upon a formula wheere he and I together could, without the political liability and the probability of further debasing truth in herent in this, and he refused to respond. Sylvia also knows this. It is in a letter eh has. She also asked no question, had no interest. Motive again, and again not mine. So, when more than a year, perhaps two years ago, when I was willing to cut them on in the credit of which they make so great a point, they were silent, they adbicated, and they now make libellous and knowingly false accusations/

Wecht's "opportunity to let t e truth out". Come on, even for Sylvia this should have been too much for you to swallow without the kind of comment you do not indicate making. He doesn't know the truth and can add nothing to what is, despite all their lying, a matter of public record. My work is copyrighted and is on file and others, including Nichols, have readd it at the Library of Congress.

Where you talk about crediting the WR, I hope you told her what you do not here say, that nobody really believes the WR or has for years. The power of subpena the WC did not use is not the responsibility of the Kennedys or the liberals today. Your point on the fact that this is beyond probable press understanding is quite correct. They'd not have time anyway, if even space. The press does not have the function of doing anything more than what is reported, and Sylvia is not about to miss a chance to gut any Lennedy, whateever her inner motive. When you said "it would rpotect the lies of the gov't as it has always done"and follow this with "She said this should not stop us." can it be that you require anything else for understand of what your position should be or her's and Cyril's is?

Can it possibly be the quest for truth, even in what she terms "pure" form? What has any of this to do with what you say she said is her primary interest, Oswald? You are ~~dropping~~ from your own ms. this same area because you agreed with Tink that it is not directly relevant. She can have other reasons, but not "Oswald", on whom she has in any event failed to do the work she could have.

"Shaky rationalization" as applied to exculpating the FBI et al requires no word.

My God! of what Vecht is capable if she says he has to be "prepared" after he alone sees this stuff. Has he any decent right to ask to see it, or anyone to associate with him or his request? (Aand with what she has heard him say on Kohn John, in NYC, she has no comparison for you between him and Garrison? He even plagiarized Garrison there!) Why should anyone have to "prepare" the head of the forensic pathologists after he see this stuff if there is any reason why he should see it? And is it not inherent in this that even for an expert to see it requires steling my work, that without it he can't accomplish his purposes in seeing it? Not inherent that in and of itself the film is not enough?

You ar right, as a generality, in the point about legitimacy of the materials. You tell me one source other than my painful, costly and very time-consuming work over a long period of years that can in any way address this? Including your one example, addressed above. Under both the contract and the law he can't "demand an accounting of them". The law requires only what exists i n the form of a document and that in non-exempt status. Based on what he knows, how can he without ruin to himself, us and his own reputation "make it clear that this stuff cannot be authenticated". Want me to? That is hardly the point, so I'm really raising a still new question, no offense, your competence to prepare him for other than a new disaster? I can "authenticate" this film in a way that would stack up in court, if a few people might be embarrassed by it, and there is no written record he can demand that is not in the public record, even court records. Careful, Howard, very, very careful! There is too much even you do not understand even after going over my work with some care. At this point, given the abundant and redundant representations of their motive and lack of integrity, I couldn't care less how Cyril and Sylvia hurt themselves, but do you for a moment think that can isolate all critical work from their own new disasters? Will we and truth not be among its new victims, not just other innocents? I can, on a very personal level, ruin your chances with your book. I am not threatening. But I also want both your eyes wide open when you decide. You let Cyril say what you want and the opening would be greater than a nuclear carrier needs.

Superficially your "debriefing" is reasonable. As a means of getting an uncorrupted record of what he saw it is, of course, fine. But don't kid yourself that it will end hazards in the press. He can't just get up, make a speech, and then walk out. That would be worse. Can you imagine his getting an easy questioning by the committed press, by the most invilved journaliztic whores in the worlds? Do you suppose the feebs don't listen to Long John? Or that there is no chance they'll not have one of their boys primed on his "soncpiracy" bit? Don't you realize that it was not until long after this, more than six months after his request, that he got his OK? And how can he "clear" with you anything he will say when you will not be there when he is questioned and he couldn't and wouldn't dare ask you if you were? It will not be your press conference but his, remember. And if he was unwilling to credit my work when using it under easier conditions, do you think this self-seeker is about to credit a long-haired kid (to him and to the press, if not to us)? You are below Alice-in*Wonderland approaches here.

There is even less chance that I will now talk to him after what Sylvia said to you about me and the unintended confirmation of my worst fears about them both. Besides, remember that it is possible I could have been the one granted access. I was solicited and I refused i several times. If would not do th this in my own name without the backstopping of an available PM, why should I for an incompetent, to say nothing of one of dubious intents and purposes? (And is not my position on refusing to apply when solicited a sufficient refutation of all the slanders in that area?)

There is nothing in our correspondence to even indicate her feeling that she can't get a,ong with me. Nor is there anything inmour few personal contacts. This is her new creation, for she needs some justification. What has that to do with her seeing what I have?I have had samples with me in NYC when I was with her and she would not promise what she has promised and lived up to with every fink, confidentiality? Her sense of frustration may be very real, but I suggest it has different origins, her own subconscious, her inability

to justify her position and her tragically clear record with her fine intelligence, her failures, her too-many errors in judgement so in conflict with that extraordinary intelligence, and as I began realizing before I saw the page proofs in the summer of 67 and now am entirely convinced about, her all-consuming jealousy. Historically, save for mine, hers is the one viable work to date. I have not only beaten her with it but gone so very far beyond it that while I do not suggest this is in her consciousness, it eats her sunbconscious. Examine all the many time you quote her on me on "credit", "selfishness" etc. where you have an independent record of your own knowledge to use as a measure of the validity of her complaint. She has refused to see what I have for about 8 years, every responsible critic who has wanted to has, many in the press have, I have given much of it away, I gave all his testimony to the unspeakably incompetent and insensitive Cyril, I have all of the first part of PM to Garrison, got "credit" for none of it, including when she stole it from her, and I am "selfish", or "self-seeking"? She admitted it about Cyril, according to your memo. She knows I let Ned have all of it, and much more. How can she with any pretense of any approximation of honesty say such a thing! And she also had the first two parts of PM and declined the third. Can anything ever have a better or more unequivocal record, can anything possibly be more one-sided, especially in a competitive field and with competitors? Motives screams from her diatrives, as does intellectual corruption. I am as indignant as I must sound. I find this the most terrible self-indictment, perhaps a more total one because it is so unrealized.

I doubt she gave you any but the corrupt Garrison illustration about "an utter sense of frustration around him [i.e.,me] when there is a differernce" with her. Tha last is almost centuries old. But in every case it was detached from evidence of the assassination. She admits her errors, not that she ever did anything to correct them or mitigate the damage she did, about Salandria. Espetin and Lifton. I could make a pretty long list, beginning with Forman, of those she didn't tell you about (and how never having been anything but wrong in these matters she is suddenly justified in pretending she now can'T be wrong and that when she has already rejected any discussion of the questions, defies as it debases the intellect). But we have never had any disagreement on or in any discussion of evidence, so what except personal shame can be the basis of her allegation? And, of course, that she suffers what she attributes to me, the difference being that she hasn't earned it and has done what she could ti impede it, which is not to include what can be, failing to help it. Motive again, loud and clear to me.

She was sure stretching your credulity and her own imagination and credibility to suggest that"perhaps Cyril's dealings with Harold at the 1969 trial at Halleck's court turned him off." Quite the contrary, all the correspondence follows it, all the "dealings". And when I succored him without even thanks, giving him all his testimony, as she also acknowledges? You can't catch all such things as they happen, but you should have picked enough up in thinking that conversation that I am sure must have been hell for you over. But she and Cyril "missed everything in the panel report", only now they can see, now they have good judgement? The only way possible is from a stolen PM, which Ned undoubtedly provided. Or the two earlier parts, which each could have copied when they had them.

She missed this stuff because it was "her busiest time of the year"? But I didn t on two hours a night's sleep and with all the travelling, fighting with Garrison and Salandria (and she lied to you elsewhere, because she also knew all about this), all the great emotional turmoil in w ich I was caught up? Again, they indict themselves, not praise me.

If she can (and she did and does) credit Epstein, there is no such thing as her suffering "humiliation" from the mere act of crediting. Or others I could name, like Tink, who she knows is a crook. And worse.

Glad to know that they both got the death certificate. And aide from what I know is intellectual garbage she gave you here and think is no better legally, Cyril got its contents from me on his word he'd keep it confidential. No theif has the right to give away what is not his. What would she say if Jerry gave her my typewiter or my car?

"Dhe said she had tried to help Harold". I'd like a single example. It is as gross a lie as she could tell. And she refused, as you must know, even todo so little as blue-pencil the two earlier parts of PM when she read them. Cyril has "taken great professional risks"? How? Can it interfere with his being coroner? Did it not preceed his election to head the forensic pathologists? Does it not attract private, mal-practise cases to him? They yield enormously. He has run no risk, and the comparison is pretty obvious.

Her personal vilifications, so long hidden, are unworthy of attention. However, you would make a serious mistake to not take this kind of thing as a sample of what you may be getting into, what you can expect if you and she disagree afterward.

When you say she wanted you to steal my material if it is "essential" to Wecht's examination, do you fail to realize her self-revelation and intent, her morality, her ethics? Could you not detect it(penult full graph p 4) Perhaps your attempts to be as honest in your memo as one can be misleads me, but to me this has all the subtlety of an elephant in must.

The tragic thing is that I failed to "get pissed off at Garrison'for the wrong wrong reasons', i.e., because he was not giving Harold credit." Look at the back of PW if you think I was unaware of it, and that story appeared before my first trip to N.O. Or that I continued to try and help him straighten himself out after that shameful bit with Turner and Ramparts, sometime around 11/17. Or my continuing after he actually used big hunks of the intro to PW in the speech that got him most attention, the LA one of 11/67. I knew he would because he tried it out on me in his den several days in advance and I opened to pp. 8 ff of the intro and showed them to him. Sylvia is galled, in fact, because she can't understand that I have been unselfish when I considered it required by the common good. remind me to tell you the joke I pulled on Garrison about his repeated fluffing of my line, "No matter how humble his gathering of faggots" etc. It is quite the opposite of her self-serving hokum. It was disillusionment about utter and complete incompetence. A case can be made against my having anything to do with Garriosn after a certain point, but it is not here. That can be further refuted by what you know: letting him owe me about $1,000 long after what she can possibly have in mind, letting him have two parts of PM (for letting Cyril have II was in Garrison's suit in DC), helping him in Dallas, before the Shaw trial, and many other things, including a great labor having nothing to do with Shaw for several months before that trial. These things can be criticized with some elgitimacy, although in retrospect I think what I did was correct. But these she doesn't allege, does she? Merely someone else's horseshit that become truth to her because it comforts her troubled mind. Or should I say guilty one?

She was really leaning on you in this representation: you "had to consider if" I "was not merely throwing a 'political smokescreen' - even unconsciously - over"my "real desire to protect" my "work at the expense of truth." I begin with the end. "Truth" in her mouth is the equivalent of love in that of a whore in this context. That is not only not her objective but she is doing what has to risk making it perhaps forever impossible to establish. I do, of course, ant to protect my own work. But what the hell is that "political smokescreen" jazz? Have I been wrong? Sure. Including, it is now clear, about her and what I conceived as her high integrity. And about others. But I'll stack my record against any, especially hers. And how does "truth" become the victim of all this? You yourself told her there was little if any prospect of adding to what we now know and some danger. This means that suddenly Cyril and vicariously ~~(meaning against me, too)~~ will establish "truth"? I think your next graph, which deals with the possibility of backfiring, is relevant, for there is close to no possibility of adding new information, so that new discovery of what she calls "truth" is a chimera and a trap. For you. I could get what you might consider paranoid about this whole thing, for her mind is becoming increasinlg clear to me, I fear. She is eaten by something, and I think it began with jealosy and is now God alone knows where. Here you refer to Wecht's need for "responsible, informed advice". If Sylvia can offer any opinion, she should qualify. If he needs it, he can't qualify for seeing that stuff except as a self-seeker, a publicuty-seeker who is conning everybody but rwally has the enormous attention to his malpractise business in mind. And his professional standing. If he needs help he needs out.

That you face a difficult decision is true. Wjatever you decide you run risks. This is why, even in shock, I told you that you must do what at the time you do it you are certain is correct. It may in the end be wrong, but if you are certain in your own mind it is as of the time of decision correct, you'll have least trouble with yourself later. Whichever way, you'll have no trouble with me -if you leave my material 100% out and if you do not have anything to do with the unauthorized use of it in any way by any one.

One of the things you should think about further is:"To me, any way I decide must be

make a compromise. I dom not think I will be 'pure' by refusing to have anything to do with this operation even though I ma now against it, for I will be denying Cyril the help he needs if he is to do anything responsible, whatever the consequences." (your next sentence is remarkable honesty and is commendable.) I refrain from any further comment, but I encourage you to think about it in whatever time you have left. I realize I have a number of advantages over you, one in more experience, another in having anticipated this a long time before it happened and tried, as in offering Cyril an alternative that had no possibility of hurting us, about two years ago. The only trouble I have with my decision is that it is against my personal interest. Quite the opposite what you have been fed. The only possible prospect for PM is for there to be the stink I would avoid. The book is done and has been. At worst he will validate what I did long ago, certainly no literary liability. The credit garbage is an incredible one for you to go for, for you know the work is already done and copyrighted. If they use it, it remains my work in any kind of term that can be called "credit". In refusing to be with Cyril, I am denying attention to myself and on the subject of this book. You do not have any parallels. This does not ease your problems, thus I enocurage the pain of rethinking, for you will have to live with whatever you decide.

There are but short graphs left in your memo. The penult you should t ink about further. The last sentence is an impossibility. There is no way you can "avert" that of which in his ignorance and with his wierdo concepts must come out if he is questioned as the press, if it pays attention or if any one competent reporter is briefed, grills him. If he does not meet the press and talk freely, for what purpose is he seeking access to this stuff? And what will he say if anyone quotes himself to him, like that Long John stuff for a single example?

In fairness to you - and be prepared to consider this as critically and as unwillingly as possible I think you really have to ask yourself why Sylvia began with the inclusion of all the people she detests, like the CTIA; and Gary and Jerry, who she knows are unqualified; and you, and is immediately prepared, for purposes of getting you involved. Is there any other critic with whom she has not broken relationship she could have involved? Like Lifton and Hoch? Dick is not known as a critic. There is nobody else. Why, then, did she want total involvement of the part of the critical community she could try to involve? My own belief is so that she will not share the guilt and responsibility alone or that, in your case, she can tell, if only herelf, that you, not she, knew the medical evidence.

I think you should be asking yourself why Cyril should need any kind of help. He is going in to see the pictures and X-rays. If he can't come out and tell what they show, why is he going in? He can read them or he can't. They are independent of anything honestly intended. I think you should, if you agree with this-and if you don't save the argument for when we are face to face again -be asking yourself why he and Sylvia do not see this. What <u>else</u> is either up to, or both?

The context and the timing need no further exposition. You are aware of the possibility of exculpating 100% of those guilty for the opposite of the truth the saintly Sylvia says she seeks. How can your association in any way influence this

If you do as you say you will, leave all my work out of it, how can your presence hurt me? I don't see the chance of this?

What remains? Cyril comes out and says it was all a big lie and the film proves it. The press and the government do not do what I fear. How, then, is anyone besides perhaps me hurt, and how are you needed? There is ntohing you can do to reduce the hurt to me, if that is your intent. And there is nothing needed of you that I can see if this is what happens. If there are alternatives I have not mentioned, I'm trying to speed. This has taken much time. I haven't even looked at the rest of the mail and it is about 3 (no calls, either).

There is one new thing that has become apparent to me. Be careful not to be prejudiced by this. I'm not going to reread your memo to be sure, either. But if there is a <u>single</u> truthful thing youbattribute to Sylvia, I can't remember. I think she is at best out of control. Her venom, her hatred of me is no longer hidden. If you haven't read the file, you know you can whenever you want. If you do, I urge you to read my Armoni and Salandria files (she didn't include Armoni in her kistakes, did she?) going back to the <u>Spring</u> of 1966 with hers. You'll get a new definition of "purity" and "truth" and other human qualities. And of Sylvia. And of why Cyril never trusted her. And of me and what I've not let interfere with our common possibilities...May whatever you do be what you can best accept afterward. I understand your problem and position, regret it, and can help only as I have tried,